


Appendix: Whistleblower Documents

Grave LNDD Cross Contamination

■ Clear grounds for revoking accreditation



Please read the caveats at the beginning of the appendix.

Does WADA know about this latest, serious problem with LNDD?

Again, I have not been able to independently verify the authenticity of the documents in the last few slides, but LNDD and the purported recipients or senders of these documents should be able to attest to their legitimacy. In this example, the involved swimmer, apparently acquitted in the B sample could also come forward.

So far, I have not seen denials from these principals as to the substance of the contents of these documents.

On the left, WADA Science Director Olivier Rabin apparently wrote to LNDD, demanding to know what happened.

On the right, LNDD Director Jacques de Ceaurriz replied in this letter.

Again, note that this problem is reported for an analysis that occurred July 4, 2006—during the Tour de France.

Again, according to WADA standards, this is grounds for revocation of the laboratories accreditation.

Has the lab been sanctioned or otherwise penalized? I don't know.

If athletes are openly sanctioned, shouldn't the labs' status be public?

Again, Floyd's drug test is negative.

By WADA's rules, the lab should be sanctioned, not Floyd.